

### **Remarks**

This is in response to the Office Action dated June 9, 2009 and subsequent to the interview held between the examiner and the undersigned on August 25, 2009, for which the undersigned expresses his appreciation to the examiner.


To remove the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph rejection, per discussion in the aforementioned interview, the recitation "main substrate" of the device has been removed from claims 1 and 16-18.

Claims 1, 3-8, 12-14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Arterburn (US 4,644,977); claims 9-11 were rejected as being obvious over Arterburn ; and claim 15 was deemed to be obvious over Arterburn in combination with Glynn (Us 5,415,634).

It is submitted that Arterburn fails to anticipate claims 1 and 16-18 insofar as it discloses a hose that is "abrasive and stain resistant" (column 1, lines 35-40), which renders the Arterburn hose to have properties that are not normally required in medical catheters. Further, there is no suggestion in Arterburn that the hose be used under ultrasound observation and no suggestion that the foam layer in the hose would increase the ultrasound visibility. The foam layer in the Arterburn hose is there to make the hose "flexible, lightweight ... improves the economics because it reduces the density, using less material per unit length." (Column 1, lines 7-16) Arterburn therefore fails to disclose the claimed invention as set forth in the claims. Moreover, the cited prior art fails to disclose a coextruded layered medical device or plastic shaft.

In light of the foregoing, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application and pass the same to issue at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Louis Woo, Reg. No. 31,730  
Law Offices of Louis Woo  
717 North Fayette Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 299-4090

Date: Sept 4, 2009